



1 Court's Order of November 21, 2023, at 2), but no such request has been filed as of the date of  
2 this Order. (See, generally, Dkt.).

3 A district court may dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with court orders.  
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link, 370 U.S. at 629-30, 82 S.Ct. at 1388 (authority to dismiss for failure  
5 to prosecute necessary to avoid undue delay in disposing of cases and congestion in court  
6 calendars); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court may dismiss  
7 action for failure to comply with any court order). Dismissal, however, is a severe penalty and  
8 should be imposed only after consideration of the relevant factors in favor of and against this  
9 extreme remedy. Thompson v. Housing Auth. of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir.1986).  
10 These factors include: "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's  
11 need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability  
12 of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits."  
13 Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61); see  
14 Applied Underwriters, Inc. v. Lichtenegger, 913 F.3d 884, 891 (9th Cir. 2019) ("By its plain text,  
15 a Rule 41(b) dismissal . . . requires 'a court order' with which an offending plaintiff failed to  
16 comply."). "Although it is preferred, it is not required that the district court make explicit findings  
17 in order to show that it has considered these factors and [the Ninth Circuit] may review the record  
18 independently to determine if the district court has abused its discretion." Ferdik, 963 F.2d at  
19 1261.

20 Having considered the Pagtalunan factors, the court is persuaded that this action should  
21 be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute. Plaintiff's failure to  
22 file the request for entry of default hinders the court's ability to move this case toward disposition  
23 and indicates that plaintiff does not intend to litigate this action. In other words, plaintiff's  
24 "noncompliance has caused [this] action to come to a complete halt, thereby allowing [him] to  
25 control the pace of the docket rather than the Court." Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990  
26 (9th Cir. 1999) (internal quotation marks omitted). Further, plaintiff was warned that failure to file  
27 a request for entry of default would result in a dismissal of the action for lack of prosecution and  
28 failure to comply with a court order. (See Dkt. 11, Court's Order of November 21, 2023, at 2-3);

1 see also Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262 (“[A] district court’s warning to a party that his failure to obey  
2 the court’s order will result in dismissal can satisfy the consideration of alternatives requirement.”)  
3 (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, having considered the Pagtalunan factors, the court is  
4 persuaded that the instant action should be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order and  
5 failure to prosecute.

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that judgment be entered dismissing this action,  
7 without prejudice, for failure to prosecute and comply with the orders of the court.

8 Dated this 28th day of November, 2023.

9 /s/  
10 Fernando M. Olguin  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28